

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12 and 15-20 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, and 15-20 are understood to be novel under 35 USC §102(e) over "Alam" (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,124 to Alam et al.). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action does not show that all the limitations of the claims are taught by Alam.

In regards to claim 1, the limitations include "for each line, clustering the words of the line into one or more word clusters, wherein each cluster includes one or more words, each cluster having a horizontal beginning point, horizontal midpoint, and horizontal end point; and for clusters in the plurality of lines, comparing alignment of the horizontal beginning point, horizontal midpoint, and horizontal end point of clusters between lines, wherein a cluster in a first line is aligned with a cluster in a previous line if at least one of the horizontal beginning point, horizontal midpoint, and horizontal end point of the cluster in the first line is aligned with at least one of the horizontal beginning point, horizontal midpoint, and horizontal end point of the cluster in the previous line; and identifying a line as being part of a table in response to more than one cluster of the line being aligned with clusters of previous lines identified as part of the table."

From these limitations it can be seen that the identifying of a line as being part of a table requires the alignment of more than one cluster between a line and a previous line. The limitations all relate to identifying table data in a document. The teachings of Alam that are relied upon in the Office Action do not all relate to identifying table data and do not correspond to the claim limitations.

In asserting correspondence of Alam's teachings to the claim limitations, the parts of Alam that are relied upon are not all for identifying table data; the cited teachings of Alam are for different aspects of converting input document data into a format for manipulation and display. The parts of Alam that are relied upon are for: (1) determining whether a line belongs to a paragraph, and (2) for locating tables in a document.

Alam's teachings for determining whether a line belongs to a paragraph are not described as being used for locating tables in a document. That is, Alam teaches using

the left X coordinate of the first word of a line relative to the X coordinate of the first word of a previous line to determine whether the line is part of a paragraph, not to determine whether a line is part of a table (col. 10, l. 55 - col. 11, l. 7). Alam neither teaches nor suggests using the left X coordinate of the first word of a line relative to the X coordinate of the first word of a previous line for locating tables in a document. Rather, Alam teaches an approach that does not use the X coordinates of words in lines. Alam teaches evaluating horizontal and vertical projection profiles and analyzing white space disclosed by the vertical projection profiles in locating tables (col. 12, l. 45-52). Thus in locating tables, Alam analyzes white space, not alignment of clusters.

From the foregoing it is clear that the limitations of “comparing alignment of the horizontal beginning point, horizontal midpoint, and horizontal end point of clusters between lines ... and identifying a line as being part of a table in response to more than one cluster of the line being aligned with clusters of previous lines identified as part of the table,” all of which are for identifying whether a line is part of a table, are not taught by Alam’s determining whether a line is part of a paragraph using left X coordinates of the first words of two adjacent lines and locating tables using white space and not considering the X coordinates of words in adjacent lines.

Independent claims 7 and 12 include limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are not shown to be anticipated by Alam for at least the reasons set forth above.


Claims 3, 5, 16, 17, and 18 depend from claim 1, claims 9 and 19 depend from claim 7, and claims 15 and 20 depend from claim 12. These dependent claims include limitations that further refine the limitations of the respective base claims. Thus, the Office Action does not show that Alam teaches the limitations of claims 3, 5, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20.

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, and 15-20 should be withdrawn because the Office Action has not shown that Alam anticipates all the limitations of the claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the remarks set forth above. No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (HPCO.141C1).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274